

1 the Oz site. And they may be able to build fences
2 and so on to keep children out of it that come to
3 the Oz site, but there's also supposed to be,
4 on-site, this huge development of homes that's
5 involved, too. So it would be difficult to keep
6 the kids out year round. I don't think it makes
7 sense to proceed until you can really figure out
8 what's in there.

9 Finally, they talk about a high capacity
10 natural gas line with no details as to the risk
11 associated with probably a 50-year-old set of
12 pipes. The sewer pipes are in terrible shape with
13 inflow and infiltration to the extent that the
14 sewer plant peaks at above its hydraulic capacity.
15 I suspect the same problems are there with this
16 natural gas line. They explode every now and then
17 in this country and people are killed. And I think
18 the EA should have looked into that more deeply as
19 to how they're going to prevent any risk of all
20 that construction around this existing network of
21 gas lines. They're probably very extensive because
22 it was a large industrial facility and needed a lot
23 of natural gas.

24 So, in conclusion, this Environmental
25 Assessment is severely flawed and does not meet the

1 requirements of the National Environmental Policy
2 Act. It should be thrown out and a new study
3 commissioned and supervised by a neutral third
4 party, but paid for by the U.S. government. Thank
5 you very much.

6 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you,
7 Mr. Volland. The next speaker is Claus Wawrzinek.

8 MR. WAWRZINEK: Hi. My name is
9 Claus Wawrzinek. I live at 7478 Village Drive in
10 Prairie Village, Kansas. I am very concerned about
11 the process, just like the previous gentleman,
12 Craig Volland. I think the federal government
13 should handle the cleanup. They're responsible for
14 making the mess and they're basically washing their
15 hands by just turning it over to Kansas and then
16 turning it over to the developers. I think they
17 should handle the cleanup; they should turn over
18 clean land to the developers or the people of
19 Kansas.

20 Also, well, there has not been enough
21 testing done. It seems like most of the
22 contaminants are listed as unknown components or
23 compounds and further testing needs to be done.
24 Also, there is no budget anywhere for the cleanup
25 so it's unknown how much money it will cost for

1 whoever will take this on. I am sure it's fairly
2 easy to make the mess, but it's going to be very
3 expensive to clean it up for whoever is going to do
4 that.

5 I would also assume there is going to be
6 lots of lawsuits and that's going to be expensive
7 for whoever is going to get that land, so that's
8 another reason why the government should clean it
9 up before anything else happens. I'm also strongly
10 opposing any development because of the fact that
11 it's going to cause more people to move out here
12 into what is still a gap between Lawrence and
13 Kansas City. It would also constitute urban
14 sprawl, which would be subsidized by the
15 government. I strongly oppose that.

16 I would urge you to clean up the land
17 first and revise the environmental impact study.
18 And also the 30-day period to have public input is
19 probably not enough, I think. It takes about 30
20 days just to look at the material and print it. I
21 would also ask you to extend that period half a
22 year, maybe longer. Thank you.

23 MR. McGUIRE: Thank you. Next
24 speaker is Rick Zbinden. I'm sorry if I butchered
25 it.

1 MR. ZBINDEN: I am Rick Zbinden,
2 Z-b-i-n-d-e-n. My address is 3801 Roanoke Road.
3 I'm in Kansas City, Missouri. However, I am
4 speaking for the Metropolitan Coalition for
5 Sensible Transportation, which is a bi-state
6 regional citizen's group.

7 The EA is severely flawed because it does
8 not take into account the effect of such a huge,
9 enormous fringe development, in fact, the only
10 urban fringe on our transportation system. Johnson
11 County citizens, and last month the commission,
12 voted to approve CARNP, which is an arterial road
13 plan, which emphasizes that any expansion in the
14 Johnson County transportation system would occur on
15 existing arterial roadways and would only occur
16 when needed; that is, if and when the population
17 growth exceeds the road lane miles that are
18 available.

19 It is anticipated by CARNP that any road
20 expansions would occur well into the future. We're
21 talking 30, 40, maybe 50 years from now. It is
22 also intended that neither Johnson County, nor any
23 other government, would blow that plan, by
24 subsidizing sprawl, leapfrog development on its own
25 with such a joint subsidy to one developer. In

1 other words, that CARNP, the plan that the citizens
2 reviewed and that the commission voted on, would
3 not get blown by what we're talking about here
4 tonight, but that's exactly what would happen.

5 There is no place in CARNP for the failed
6 21st Century Parkway or the "Porkway," as we call
7 it, which the citizens of Johnson County clearly
8 demonstrated they were against three years ago.

9 Now, the Oz project is a classic example
10 of leapfrog development which is subsidized by all
11 levels of government. So the U.S. government wants
12 to give thousands of acres of land away to one
13 large developer, and so maybe the State will give
14 them \$250 million to boot, but is the subsidy in
15 there? Not at all. Just speaking in our
16 transportation system, this project would renew
17 crying from this developer, as well as any other
18 speculative developer in south and southwestern
19 Johnson County, for the failed "Porkway." They
20 would want to revise that again and this is their
21 ticket.

22 Johnson County already has a problem
23 getting low-wage service workers to jobs in the
24 outer suburbs. This leapfrog development project
25 would severely make that problem worse. There

JAY E. SUDDRETH & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Kansas
(913) 492-0111

Missouri
(816) 471-2211

1 would be cries from Oz, and from anyone else who
2 wants to develop out here, that the Johnson County
3 transit system is taxed as it is and underfunded as
4 it is, would have to get urban-core workers out
5 here. Not that they would come because the bus
6 rides and the many transfers would probably take
7 them an hour, hour and a half to get here. And
8 there's another subsidy of this project.

9 The location of this project is
10 ridiculous when you consider that there's plenty
11 of, quote, unquote, "in fill" locations for
12 something of this nature, that you do not have to
13 develop this far out. Our organization is very
14 unhappy that the county commission has decided that
15 they are for this project without consulting the
16 citizens. Thank you.

17 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you. The next
18 speaker is Nancy Moneymaker.

19 MS. MONEYMAKER: I wish to thank GSA
20 for holding this public hearing. Donna Meyer of
21 GSA told me that this hearing is not required for
22 the process to move forward. I only hope the State
23 of Kansas and Johnson County will also soon afford
24 us the same courtesies of a public hearing in a
25 timely manner and in a convenient location for the

JAY E. SUDDRETH & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Kansas
(913) 492-0111

Missouri
(816) 471-2211

1 people most impacted by the decisions.

2 I was not going to speak tonight and I am
3 very nervous, but here I am. I have been told that
4 this is my only format to right a wrong done to my
5 comments at the last public hearing and then
6 included in the Environmental Audit. I will say
7 that my comments were in writing and in GSA's
8 position -- possession months before the
9 publication of the Environmental Audit. The
10 unchecked transcribed result was that some of my
11 material was deleted, some was misquoted, and then
12 it was published in the EA for all to see.

13 Once again, for the record, on October
14 28, 1998, first error found is when I commented on
15 a working farm as we have at the Zimmerman's place
16 now, not a non-working farm.

17 Number 2: The National Park Service has
18 written that of the, not although, 400,000 square
19 miles of tallgrass prairie that once covered the
20 North American continent, less than one percent
21 remains.

22 Number 3: My example tallgrass prairie
23 is called Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, not
24 Lugewa National Tallgrass Prairie.

25 Number 4: James Lyons is with the

1 Natural, not National, Resources and Environment.
2 That's who he is with.

3 Number 5: Bill Maason, Johnson County
4 Park & Rec land acquisition specialist; they
5 butchered his name.

6 Number 6: Southern Johnson County does
7 continue to receive the County's green benefits
8 with parks, prairies and arboretums.

9 Number 7: Next is the transcriber's
10 error that I was most irritated with. I mentioned
11 Sam's Town in Missouri as an example of what I
12 think this Oz development will become. In no way
13 did I mention Sandstone.

14 Number 8: Then I said that I would
15 rather not see another behemoth go extinct, not
16 building sink, in the long run.

17 Number 9: The part that was left out
18 completely was my statement that a city council
19 person once told me, and this is true, that the
20 worst part of the job is living with past mistakes
21 and don't make this huge opportunity turn into a
22 past mistake. If I were to edit a part out, it
23 would not be that closing piece.

24 Number 10: There are other errors that I
25 will skip, but they're there nonetheless.

1 As I mentioned to Mrs. Meyers of GSA, the
2 errors made to my small part of this EA lead me to
3 wonder about the checks and balances and
4 comprehensiveness of the rest of the EA. I believe
5 that a complete and accurate EA could have been
6 finished by now due to the availability of
7 extensive material accessible on the subject. Any
8 shortcomings found in the EA I attribute to GSA
9 feeling the timetable pressures that Oz
10 Entertainment is putting on everyone involved. I
11 am told by Donna Meyer of GSA that this is the
12 first time she has had this particular problem with
13 a public hearing transcript and I believe that she
14 will take steps to see that other private citizens'
15 comments are accurate when published.

16 If a more complete EA is required of GSA,
17 I believe that Sunflower will still remain able to
18 be disposed of when all is said and done. There
19 hasn't been an Army ammunition site that has not
20 been deemed as not able to be disposed of.

21 According to Cover Page 1, this will
22 leave two alternatives open to GSA: Disposal of
23 the entire property to the State of Kansas; and
24 disposal of individual parcels to one or more
25 entities over a period of time. I assume this to

1 be through public transfer conveyances. I believe
2 that the State of Kansas should remove their
3 proposal to pay fair market value of the entire
4 plant. This will leave Option No. 2, of which I am
5 in agreement with most of the public conveyances
6 unless any entities have plans for casino-type
7 operations.

8 Right now I have no qualms with GSA and
9 their handling of this proposal. They are acting
10 as agents for all of the citizens of the United
11 States of America. If one state which -- wishes to
12 take over the task of disposing of an asset located
13 in that state and will pay money for it, GSA would
14 be foolish to say no.

15 But as a citizen of Kansas, I have a
16 qualm because the Oz development is about
17 speculative, risk investment. If it fails, we take
18 the loss; but if it succeeds, some think we will
19 have made positive impact on the State while others
20 think we will have done nothing less than build a
21 monster. It is our hard-earned money that will
22 make this happen and our hard-earned money that
23 will be lost if it fails. Do we really want to be
24 in the business of risk investments? Remember
25 KPERS? Why do the citizens of the State of Kansas

JAY E. SUDDRETH & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Kansas
(913) 492-0111

Missouri
(816) 471-2211